

Serial No. 10/590,913
Reply to Office Action dated March 29, 2010

JUN 29 2010

Docket No. 1006/0143PUS1

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Favorable reconsideration and allowance of the present application is respectfully requested. Claims 1, 4, 5 and 7-24 are pending in the above application with claim 1 being independent. By the above amendment, claims 3, 6, 25 and 26 have been cancelled without prejudice.

The Office Action dated March 29, 2010, has been received and carefully reviewed. In that Office Action, objections were raised in connection with the drawings. In addition, claims 1 and 25 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as not being supported by the specification, claims 1, 25 and 26 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite, claims 1, 5, 7-12, 14, 15 and 17-24 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Johnson in view of Alber, claims 3, 4, 13 and 16 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Johnson in view of Alber and further in view of Engel, and claim 6 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Johnson in view of Alber and further in view of Iritani. Each of these issues is addressed below, and reconsideration and allowance of claims 1 and 4, 5 and 7-24 are respectfully requested in view of the above amendments and the following remarks.

STATEMENT OF SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW

A personal interview was conducted on April 20, 2010, and attended by examiner Rudy Travis, Supervisory Patent Examiner Franz Jules, and Applicant's representative. Claim 1 and the references to Johnson and Alber were discussed. Applicant argued that the structure required by claim 1, including the limitations regarding a "convex

Serial No. 10/590,913
Reply to Office Action dated March 29, 2010

Docket No. 1006/0143PUS1

polyhedron" were not shown or suggested by the art of record. The examiners maintained that there was no support in the application for the "convex polyhedron" limitations. The examiners indicated, however, that if claim 1 were amended to include the limitations of claims 3 and 6, as shown above, the new claim would overcome the art of record. The examiners also agreed to withdraw the drawing objections.

DRAWING OBJECTION

The drawings were objected to based on their line quality. During the interview, the examiners agreed to withdraw this objection. The drawings were also objected to for failing to show the convex polyhedron recited in claims 1, 25 and 26. By the above amendment, claims 25 and 26 have been cancelled without prejudice and this limitation has been cancelled from claim 1. Wherefore the withdrawal of the drawing objections is respectfully requested.

REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. 112, FIRST AND SECOND PARAGRAPHS

Claims 1 and 25 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, and claims 1, 25 and 26 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph based on language related to "convex polyhedron." By the above amendment, claims 25 and 26 have been cancelled, and the limitation regarding a convex polyhedron has been removed from claim 1. The withdrawal of the rejections of claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. 112, first and second paragraphs is respectfully requested in view of these amendments.

JUN 29 2010

Serial No. 10/590,913
Reply to Office Action dated March 29, 2010

Docket No. 1006/0143PUS1

REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. 103(a)

Claim 1 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Johnson in view of Alber. During the interview, the examiners agreed that claim 1 would be allowable over the art of record if amended to include the limitations of claims 3 and 6. By the above amendment, the limitations of claims 3 and 6 have been added to claim 1 as suggested by the examiners. Wherefore, it is respectfully submitted that claim 1 and its dependent claims 4, 5 and 7-24 are allowable over the art of record, and the withdrawal of all rejections and the allowance of all claims is earnestly solicited.

If the examiner believes that any additional changes would place the application in better condition for allowance, the examiner is invited to contact the undersigned attorney at the telephone number listed below.

Deposit Account Authorization

To the extent necessary, a petition for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. 1.136 is hereby made. Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this, concurrent and future replies, including extension of time fees, to Deposit Account 50-3828 and please credit any excess fees to such deposit account.

Respectfully submitted,



Martin R. Geissler
Registration No. 51011

PO BOX 1364
Fairfax, VA 22038-1364
1.703.621.7140

Date: June 29, 2010